

NOTES ON THE *EUCHARISTICOS* OF PAULINUS PELLAËUS.  
TOWARDS A NEW EDITION OF THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY

To my friends Caroline Bréhaut and Alan Dearn

A. Introduction

As a grandson of the famous poet and politician Ausonius, the nobleman Paulinus hailed from Bordeaux in Aquitaine. But he was born in Macedonian Pella, whence modern scholars ‘baptised’ him *Pellaeus* to differentiate him from his more illustrious namesake and compatriot, the later bishop of Nola in Campania. Our Paulinus stayed in Southern Gaul from his childhood on. He there experienced several invasions of Germanic tribes, together with manifold transformations of his socio-political environs, which, to a large extent, were also due to the increasing acceptance of the Christian faith and, more particularly, to the rise of ascetic tendencies within this religion. In his 83<sup>rd</sup> year, i.e. in A.D. 460, Paulinus composed the *Eucharisticos*. This autobiographical poem is shaped as a ‘thanksgiving’ to God, but comprises, besides pious prayers and spiritual reflections, picturesque souvenirs of his cherished childhood as well as allusions to, if not reports of, outstanding contemporary events.

Being a prime source for the history of Late Roman – and Gallic – politics, religion, and culture, the poem of 616 verses has been much quoted, though far more seldom been studied thoroughly. This neglect may be due to the lack of elegance which is often ascribed to its language and thought in scholarly literature. But as various recent studies have shown, less prejudiced approaches allow us to develop a deeper and more adequate understanding of the poem, thereby enabling us to exploit the historical evidence contained in it more effectively.

The first critical edition of the *Eucharisticos* goes back to Wilhelm Brandes (1888). It was the basis for the translations into

French by Jacques Rocafor (1896) and into English by Hugh Evelyn White in his bilingual Loeb edition (1921). During this early period, French scholars in particular showed an interest in the biography and language of Paulinus. The latter focus was continued firstly by Charlotte Müller in her doctoral dissertation on the grammatical peculiarities (1932/33), and secondly by Claude Moussy (1976) in his prolific commentary that concentrates mainly on matters of lexicography and of syntax<sup>1</sup>.

Another issue frequently dealt with is the impact of Augustine's *Confessiones* on the *Eucharisticos*. Rocafor, Georg Misch (1907<sup>1</sup>, 1932<sup>2</sup>, Engl. transl. 1950), Pierre Courcelle (1963, 1968), and Moussy have demonstrated that the work of the bishop of Hippo was the model *par excellence* for late Roman and medieval autobiographies, including the *Eucharisticos*. But, as will be shown in a forthcoming study, it is unsatisfactory to list similarities and quotations (the number of which can easily be increased), only to conclude that the Bordelaise fabricated "a pale imitation" of the magisterial work. It would be more useful to examine how he makes use of his antecedent, and why he does so. A systematic enquiry into this subject is yet to be written<sup>2</sup>.

Besides, Courcelle's monograph on late Roman literature in the face of the barbarian invasions became highly influential (1948<sup>1</sup>,

<sup>1</sup> G. (=W.) Brandes, "Paulini Pellaei Eucharisticos", in *Poetae Christianae minores*, (CSEL 16.1), Vienna 1888, I, 263-321; H.G. Evelyn White, *Ausonius*, 2 vols., London 1921 (2.295-351: *Euch.*); C. Moussy, *Paulin de Pella, Poème d'action de grâces et Prière*, Paris 1974. For Paulinus' biography, cf. Ch. Caeymaex, "Paulin de Pella. Son caractère et son poème", *Le Musée Belge* 1, 1897a, 186-99; A. Brun, "Un poète à Marseille au V<sup>e</sup> siècle, Paulin de Pella", *Provincia* 2, 1922, 22-32. For his language, cf. Ch. Caeymaex, "La métrique de l'*Eucharisticos* de Paulin de Pella", *Le Musée Belge* 1, 1897b, 308-17; *idem*, "Le style de l'*Eucharisticos* de Paulin de Pella", *Le Musée Belge* 2, 1898, 161-67; L. Dévogel, "Étude sur la latinité et le style de Paulin de Pella", *RUB* 3, 1897/98, 443-51; 515-39; Ch. Müller, *Observationes grammaticae in Paulini Pellaei carmen Eucharisticum*, Berlin 1933; for both, cf. J. Rocafor, *De Paulini Pellaei vita et carmine*, Bordeaux 1890; *idem*, *Un type gallo-romain*, Paris 1896.

<sup>2</sup> Rocafor, *De Paulini vita*, 87-90; G. Misch, *Geschichte der Autobiographie*, I-II, 1907<sup>1</sup>, 1931<sup>2</sup>; *A History of Autobiography*, transl. in

1964<sup>3</sup>). Although direct comparison with other contemporary poems on the socio-political disruptions could have prompted more balanced conclusions on Paulinus' fate and autobiography, Courcelle reinstated the one-sided view of social and cultural decline which has dominated scholarly literature until recently and is still prevalent, e.g., in Arnaldo Marcone's works<sup>3</sup>. However, the literary value of the piece is being judged more positively today especially among Italian scholars, such as Alessandro Fo,

---

collab. with E.W. Dicks, London 1950 (repr. 1998), 546; P. Courcelle, *Les Confessions de saint Augustin dans la tradition littéraire*, Paris 1963, 207-11; *idem*, *Recherches sur les Confessions de Saint Augustin*, Paris 1968, 465; Moussy 1974, 19-22 (quotation p. 21). Cf. further A. Coşkun, "The *Eucharisticos* of Paulinus Pellaeus. Towards a Reappraisal of the Worldly Convert's Life and Autobiography", forthcoming ca. 2006, sect. II on his spiritual biography; sect. IV on the rationale of the imitations.

<sup>3</sup> P. Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions germaniques*, Paris 1948<sup>1</sup>; 1964<sup>3</sup>, 94-5, and see below. On Paulinus' literary skills, cf. R. Helm, "Paulinus von Pella", *RE* 18.4, 1949, 354: "Stümperhaftigkeit"; Misch, *Autobiographie*, 546: "with no originality in him"; Moussy, *Paulin*, 35-7; G. Malsbary, "Vergilian Elements of Christian Poetic Language. The Adaptations of Vergil's *Aeneid* 2, 6 by Paulinus of Nola, Paulinus of Pella, and Paulinus of Périgueux", in G. J. M. Bartelink et al. (eds.), *Eulogia. Mélanges offerts à Antoon A.R. Bastiaensen à l'occasion de son soixante-cinquième anniversaire*, Steenbrugge 1991, 175-82, esp. 178-80; 182: the adaptation of Verg. *Aen.* 2.6 and Hor. *carmin. saec.* 42 in *Euch.* 309-10 is unconvincingly assessed negatively; Malsbary underestimates the important role that Paulinus had played in Bordeaux and ignores the relevance of ll. 258-70 *licet ... / ... malim sopita silere / invitant ... / ... solacia ... / / prodere*, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.3-13; also L. Zurli, "Paolino di Pella ed Enea", *BStudLat* 26.2, 1996, 559-67, 561-2. for a more balanced view; but further A. Marcone, *Paolino di Pella, Discorso di Ringraziamento*, Florence 1995, 9: "in versi di qualità non superiori alla personalità del loro autore". For the exaggeration of his impoverishment and of his social decline, cf. G. Krüger, "Paulinus von Pella", in M. Schanz - C. Hosius - G. Krüger (eds.), *Geschichte der römischen Literatur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian*, vol. IV<sup>2</sup>, München 1920, 375; K.F. Stroheker, *Der senatorische Adel im spätantiken Gallien*, Tübingen 1948, 203; Moussy, *Paulin*, 28-9; J.F. Matthews, *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court*, Oxford 1975, 324-5; Ch. Johnston, "Paulinus of Pella", *History Today* 25, 1975, 768-9; J. Vogt, "Der Lebensbericht des Paulinus von Pella", in W. Eck

Emanuela Colombi, and Lorianò Zurli. To these should be added Michael Roberts, Neil McLynn, and Alicia Soler Merenciano<sup>4</sup>. Likewise, further critical inspections of the factual information provided by the autobiographer still permit us to detect stories of social continuity and success beyond the rhetoric of lamentation, as has been suggested by McLynn and myself (2002b; forthcoming) in various contexts.

---

- H. Galsterer-H. Wolff (eds.), *Studien zur antiken Sozialgeschichte*, FS F. Vittinghoff, Cologne 1980, 531; M. Heinzelmann, "Gallische Prosopographie 260-527", *Francia* 10, 1982, 666; R.W. Mathisen, "Emigrants, Exiles, and Survivors: Aristocratic Options in Visigothic Aquitania", *Phoenix* 38.2, 1984, 162-3 (repr. in *Studies in the History, Literature, and Society of Late Antiquity*, Amsterdam 1991, 1-12); *idem*, *Roman Aristocrats in Barbarian Gaul*, Austin 1993, 61: "economically ruined"; 542: "poverty-stricken exile"; W. Kirsch, "Spätantike Dichtung als Quellen zur Sozialgeschichte: Paulinus von Pella", *Index* 17, 1989, 79; J.F. Drinkwater, "The *Bacaudae* of Fifth-Century Gaul", in Drinkwater-Elton, *Fifth-Century Gaul*, 213; R. van Dam, "The Pirenne Thesis and Fifth-Century Gaul", in Drinkwater-Elton, *Fifth-Century Gaul*, 325-6; A. Marcone, "Il mondo di Paolino di Pella", in *De Tertullien aux Mozarabes. Mélanges offerts à J. Fontaines*, Paris 1992, I, 348: "Se il caso di Ausonio infatti può essere addotto come esempio di mobilità sociale verso l'alto, quello del nipote Paolino può valere come esempio di mobilità verso basso o, quanto meno, della precarietà di certi rapporti politici"; *idem*, "Late Roman Social Relations", in *CAH* XIII, 1998, 366.

<sup>4</sup> A. Fo, "Tentativo di introduzione a Paolino di Pella", in Antonio Garzya (ed.), *Metodologie della ricerca sulla tarda antichità*, Napoli 1989, 379-80, describes the skilful provocation of certain atmospheres; M. Roberts, "The Treatment of Narrative in Late Antique Literature", *Philologus* 132.2, 1988, 187-9 stresses that the particular aesthetics of Late Antiquity have also shaped the structure of the autobiography; N.B. McLynn, "Paulinus the Impenitent. A Study of the Eucharisticos", *JECS* 3, 1995, 484 claims that the "criticism of his uncertain prosody ... was ... probably less apparent to contemporaries than the cultural statement contained in his recognizably Vergilian, and therefore 'high-sounding' verses". For Paulinus' reception of classical and Christian poetry, cf. also G. Funaioli, "De Paulini Pellaei carminis *Eucharisticos* fontibus", *Le Musée Belge* 9, 1905, 159-79; Moussy, *Paulin*, 39-41; Marcone, *Paolino*, 126-7; E. Colombi, "*Rusticitas e vita in villa nella Gallia tardoantica: tra realtà e letteratura*", *Athenaeum* 84.2, 1996, 405-32; Zurli, *Paolino* (see n. 3); A. Soler Merenciano, "La oratio cristiana de dos autores profanos: Ausonio y Paolino de Pela (s. IV d. JC.)", *SEAug* 66, 1999, 127-44.

A particular legacy of Courcelle's work is the assumption that the bulk of the poem had already been composed by A.D. 455 before its purportedly 'negligent' revision and publication in 459. Such a reconstruction would have a serious impact not only on the constitution and structure of the text, but also on its historical background and, in consequence, on its value as a historical source. The analytical conception has been widely accepted, among others, by Moussy and Marcone, who have produced bilingual editions with introductions and commentaries<sup>5</sup>. Only McLynn (1995) provocatively challenged some of Courcelle's interpretations, defending the unitarian view formerly held. In a recent study on the chronological framework of the poem (2002a), I have been able to confirm the latter opinion by establishing the precise dates of Paulinus' birth (summer 377), of his conversion to the Catholic church (Easter 427), and of the poem's composition (first half of 460).

Obviously, many more matters of textual, literary and historical criticism are deserving of reassessment, an undertaking which would eventually lead to a reappraisal of the autobiography as a whole merging into a new edition, translation and commentary. *Exemplaria Classica* now provides me with a welcome audience for expounding discussions of textual criticism as well as aspects of the personal fate of Paulinus and of his socio-political environment. Needless to say, the present article cannot but be incomplete and selective. Where it is not yet possible to offer conclusive answers, at least the questions to be asked should be

<sup>5</sup> Cf. the references in A. Coşkun, "Chronology in the *Eucharisticos* of Paulinus Pellaëus. A Reassessment", *Mnemosyne* 55, 2002, 332-3 n. 4; further Roberts, *Treatment of Narrative*, 188; R. Delmaire, *Les responsables des finances impériales au Bas-Empire romain (IV<sup>e</sup>-VI<sup>e</sup> s.)*. *Études prosopographiques*, Brussels 1989, 189; B. Näf, *Senatorisches Standesbewußtsein in spätrömischer Zeit*, Fribourg-N. 1995, 129; Zurli, *Paolino*, 562 n. 12. As many other issues of controversy, Courcelle's view is ignored by Vogt, *Lebensbericht* (see n. 3), who offers an uncritical text with a German translation. For previous analytical approaches, cf. Rocaforad, *De Paulini vita*, 62-3.

refined, if not posed for the first time. The study is rounded off with a conspectus of the dates expressed in the *Eucharisticos* and a register of differing readings of the manuscripts and editions.

## B. Notes and Discussions on Selected Passages of the *Eucharisticos*

### I. Paulinus' *frater indocilis*: the Contesting of Thalassius' Testament (A.D. 407)

In A.D. 407, the premature death of Thalassius caused much pain to his son Paulinus (ll. 226-47). The loss was not only exacerbated by barbarian tribes, who, for the first time in the life of the autobiographer, raided Aquitaine, but also by a serious dispute with another son of Thalassius, who contested their father's last will (ll. 248-53):

*ilico me indocilis fratris discordia acerba  
excepit, validum genitoris testamentum  
solvere conantis specialia commoda matris* 250  
*inpugnandi animo, cuius mihi cura tuendae  
hoc quoque maior erat quo iustior, et pietatis  
non minor affectus studium firmabat honestum.*

Most commentators consider the 'stubborn brother' to be identical with Censorius Magnus Ausonius, another of the famous poet's grandsons, who is known from two letters in verse that were addressed to him in his childhood<sup>6</sup>. But they clearly reveal that he was the oldest of Ausonius' grandsons. Consequently, he was rather the son of Euromius, who had been the first husband of Paulinus' mother, before she married Thalassius towards the end of A.D. 376<sup>7</sup>. It is therefore difficult to see why Censorius Magnus Ausonius would have challenged his step-father's (or

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Aus. *Geneth.* and *Protr.* (ed. R.P.H. Green, *The Works of Ausonius*, Oxford 1991); for the identification, cf., e.g., Moussy, *Paulin*, 151; Mathisen, *Emigrants*, 163; Delmaire, *Responsables*, 188; McLynn, *Paulinus*, 470 n. 53.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Aus. *Protr.* 36-7; *Parent.* 14 (ed. Green, see n. 6); A. Coşkun, *Die*

adoptive father's?) testament on the ground that it favoured his mother unduly.

Alternatively, David Woods suggests that the brother at stake was Honoratus, the founder of the monastery at Lérins and later bishop of Arles<sup>8</sup>. He then infers that Thalassius tried to avoid the dispersal of his goods – as happened in the case of Paulinus of Nola – by the concession of special benefits to his wife<sup>9</sup>. But it is very unlikely that the devout Christian Honoratus, while pointedly leaving the secular world, could have been so impious to contest his father's will and take his mother and brother to court.

In the context of this law suit, Arnaldo Marcone has further hinted at the well-known fact that many widows unexpectedly fell into poverty<sup>10</sup>. However, this is of no relevance for the daughter of the poet Ausonius, because she owned considerable estates in Epirus and Achaea (ll. 413-9). Moreover, she had inherited further possessions in Bordeaux (ll. 317-8) and probably in Bazas (l. 332) as well<sup>11</sup>.

By hypothesising a family feud – rather than a simple issue of piety and impiety – Neil McLynn has probably come closest to the historical truth, although he fails to offer an explanation of its origin<sup>12</sup>. Perhaps the *indocilis frater* was afraid that part of his father's patrimony might be alienated. The reason may have been that the widow had one son (i.e. Censorius Magnus Ausonius) by a different husband (i.e. Euromius), who, through the testament of Thalassius, would later be entitled to inherit the same share as the children of Thalassius. It may even be that Thalassius had

---

gens Ausoniana *an der Macht. Untersuchungen zu Decimius Magnus Ausonius und seiner Familie*, Oxford 2002, 148-51, with pedigree in the appendix.

<sup>8</sup> D. Woods, "The Origin of Honoratus of Lérins", *Mnemosyne* 46, 1993, 78-86.

<sup>9</sup> Cf., e.g., Aus. *epist.* 23.35-6 (ed. Green, see n. 6); Coşkun, *Gens Ausoniana*, 99-111.

<sup>10</sup> Marcone, *Paolino*, 100-1.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Aus. *praef.* 1.5; *Epiced.* 4; *Hered.* (ed. Green, see n. 6). On Bazas cf. Coşkun, *Gens Ausoniana*, 121-8. See also below, n. 33.

<sup>12</sup> McLynn, *Paulinus*, 470, identifying the brother with Censorius Magnus Ausonius in n. 53. See also below, n. 23.



likewise been married to another woman, before becoming the son-in-law of Ausonius. Hence the latter's daughter must not necessarily have been the mother of the *frater indocilis*.

The above-quoted verses do not permit a definite decision in this regard. Likewise, the outcome of the trial remains uncertain. However, Paulinus' opponents may have lost the case, but taken revenge, when the political disruptions offered a suitable occasion, for they are later accused of profiting from his expropriation in A.D. 414, on which see below (sect. III).

## II. Paulinus and Politics: a Reconsideration of His Career (A.D. 407-14)

It is disappointing that the *Eucharisticos* provides little detail about the different tribes and their itineraries or the numerous Gallic usurpers following the invasions of A.D. 406/7. The poem contains nothing precise about the shifting allegiances, about the victories that Honorius' general Fl. Constantius achieved against the *tyranni* after 411, or about the consequences for the Gallic nobility who had predominantly backed the illegitimate emperors<sup>13</sup>. All we know for certain is that Paulinus flourished at the court of the usurper Attalus, whom king Athaulf had established early in 414. As is revealed in ll. 293-301 (on which see below), the Bordelaise served the puppet emperor as his *comes largitionum privatarum*.

<sup>13</sup> For the troublesome years 406-418, cf. Matthews, *Western Aristocracies*, 307-28; M. Rouche, *L'Aquitaine. Des Wisigoths aux Arabes 418-781*, Paris 1979, 19-27; A. Demandt, *Die Spätantike*, München 1989, 142-49; H. Wolfram, *Die Goten. Von den Anfängen bis zur Mitte des sechsten Jahrhunderts. Entwurf einer historischen Ethnographie*, München <sup>3</sup>1990, 168-80; P. Heather, *Goths and Romans 332-489*, Oxford 1991, 219-25; J.F. Drinkwater-H. Elton (eds.), *Fifth-Century Gaul: a Crisis of Identity?*, Cambridge 1992; M. Cesa, *Impero tardoantico e barbari. La crisi militare da Adrianopoli al 418*, Como 1994; J.F. Drinkwater, "The Usurpers Constantine III (407-411) and Jovinus (411-413)", *Britannia* 29, 1998, 269-98; Marcus (405, Britain), Gratian II (406, Britain), Constantine III (407-11), Constans II (407-9), Gerontius (409-11), Maximinus (409-22?), Iovinus (411-12) and Sebastianus (411?-12), Attalus (409-10 Rome, 414-15 Toulouse/ Bordeaux).



Apparently, Paulinus had chosen to cooperate with the Goths, either when they intruded into Gaul in 412, or after they had put an end to the usurper Iovinus on behalf of Honorius in 413 at the latest. Pierre Courcelle has convincingly suggested that the Aquitanian nobleman must have played a significant role in conciliating his home city with the new leading power. In contrast to Toulouse and Narbonne, Bordeaux had submitted peacefully to the invaders. As the autobiographer admits to having been the only citizen freed of the duty to lodge Gothic soldiers (l. 285)<sup>14</sup>, his prominence in the previous negotiations cannot reasonably be doubted<sup>15</sup>. Perhaps it was of some importance that Paulinus had for long been a close friend of the Alan king (l. 346 *regis dudum*

<sup>14</sup> McLynn, *Paulinus*, 473 n. 68 convincingly suggests that only Paulinus enjoyed the *privilege* of exemption, which does not necessarily mean that every other house effectively hosted Goths.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire*, 93; Moussy, *Paulin*, 155; McLynn, *Paulinus*, 473. Given the danger of the situation, it is unnecessary to purport altruistic reasons (Courcelle), but it would be even less appropriate to call him unpatriotic (Marcone, *Paolino*, 16; also Courcelle: “la noblesse bordelaise, moins patriote que celle de Marseille, Narbonne, Toulouse, pactise avec Athaulf”; Rouche, *Aquitaine*, 22: “qui préfère le salut de sa patrie locale à celui de l’Empire”), if not a traitor (Rouche 30: “collaboration ... collusion”; for Bazas, see below, n. 50): there was no alternative to coming to terms with the Goths. It would be worthwhile to examine the *Eucharisticos* more profoundly as to its author’s ‘national’ identity, or rather identities. A systematic enquiry could start by an analysis of the political statement on the *pax Gothica* in ll. 302–8 and continue with the use of the key words *patria*, *Romani* (see below, n. 34), *exilium*, and *barbari*, also *carus* (see below, n. 66), which lies beyond the scope of this paper though. For the complex issue of the ‘shifting frontiers’ between Romans, Gallo-Romans, and ‘barbarians’, cf. Moussy, *Paulin*, 25; Kirsch, *Paulinus*, 281; Drinkwater-Elton, *Fifth-Century Gaul*; R.W. Mathisen-H. Sivan (eds.), *Shifting Frontiers in Late Antiquity*, Aldershot-Hampshire 1996; *idem* (eds.), “Forging a New Identity: the Kingdom of Toulouse and the Frontiers of Visigothic Aquitania (418–507)”, in Alberto Ferreiro (ed.), *The Visigoths. Studies in Culture and Society*, Leiden 1999, 1–62; R.W. Mathisen-D. Shanzer (eds.), *Society and Culture in Late Antique Gaul. Revisiting the Sources*, Aldershot-Hampshire 2001; W. Pohl-I. Wood-H. Reimitz (eds.), *The Transformation of Frontiers from Late Antiquity to the Carolingians*, Leiden 2001.

*mihi cari*; referring to A.D. 414/15), who may have mediated in favour of the nobleman<sup>16</sup>.

However, only a few months later, unanimity between Constantius and Athaulf came to an end. The king tried to enforce his position firstly through his marriage with the imperial princess Galla Placidia on 1<sup>st</sup> January 414, and secondly by establishing Attalus as emperor. But only soon afterwards the Goths were compelled to withdraw from Aquitaine: they burnt down Bordeaux (ll. 304–14) and pillaged whatever they could get hold of in its environs, before crossing the Pyrenees late in 414 or in the course of 415<sup>17</sup>.

In any event, the likelihood that Paulinus had been a key figure at the time of their arrival in Aquitaine suggests that he had held other offices beforehand. And, in fact, the autobiography does not dismiss his previous political career entirely (ll. 264–70):

*namque et quanta mihi per te conlata potentum*  
*gratia praestiterit, facile experiendo probavi,* 265  
*saepe prius claro procerum conlatus honori*  
*ignorans proprio quam praeditus ipse potirer,*  
*quantum et econtra vi impugnante maligna*  
*ipsa patronorum mihi ambitiosa meorum*  
*obfuerint studia et nostri evidenter honores.* 270

Owing to the common bias regarding Paulinus as a light-weight personality, scholars have hitherto failed to understand the precise implications of these lines, for they have mostly thought that his offices had been only honorary, if he had indeed served in any function different from the above-mentioned *comitiva privatae largitionis*<sup>18</sup>. At first sight, the opaque qualification

<sup>16</sup> The Alans invaded Gaul in A.D. 406/7 in various groups. The people lead by Goar (see below, sect. IV), may soon have served Constantine III or Jovinus, before going over to Constantius and Athaulf. See above, n. 13.

<sup>17</sup> Rouche, *Aquitaine*, 477 n. 28 suggests that Bordeaux was occupied between the end of 413 and summer 414.

<sup>18</sup> For the translation of ll. 266–7, cf. Evelyn White, *Ausonius*, 325: “when ofttimes I was accredited unconsciously with my ancestor’s bright distinctions, ere yet I myself acquired such attributes of my own” (but

*ignorans* might lend support to this view, just as further down *solacia vana*, *absentem* and *casso honoris nomine* (ll. 293-5) might do in the context of his career at Attalus' court. However, while the 'emptiness' of the *comitiva* will be accounted for in due course, the apologetic nature of the 'ignorance of promotion' (as well as of the 'advancement in absence') is rather designed to counter the reproach of *ambitio* under illegitimate rulers, i.e. high treason. Paulinus declares that he had never coveted any office, but they had been bestowed upon him without his knowledge. Compare this with the declaration that he wished tranquillity *ab ambitione remota* (l. 204), before he denies having been *census augendi cupidus* or an *ambitor honorum*, rather calling himself a *sectator deliciarum* (ll. 215-6)<sup>19</sup>.

At any rate, ll. 265-6 (*prius ... quam ... potirer*) clearly implies that Paulinus would effectively hold at least one *clarus honor*, after being deemed worthy of such a distinction on other grounds<sup>20</sup>. Thereby, *clarus* is used synonymously for *clarissimus*, the standard qualification for the Roman senatorial class<sup>21</sup>. The highest echelon of society is further hinted at by *proceres*, the 'greats', to whom the honour was appropriate. Paulinus' point is not difficult to grasp: even without (or before) holding distinguished posts, he was regarded as one of the most noble Aquitanians, which is why he was automatically promoted to a very high a rank.

---

*proceres* does not mean *maiores*, see below); or Marcone, *Paolino*, 51: "venendomi spesso attribuiti, a mia insaputa, alti onori senza che ricoprissi alcuna carica". Although Moussy's translation (1974, 77) seems to imply some effective responsibility ("car on m'accorda souvent à mon insu les insignes honneurs dus aux grands, avant que je ne fusse en possession de la charge qui m'était destinée"), he elsewhere speaks of the *comitiva* as "seule dignité" (25).

<sup>19</sup> For the implications, cf. Marcone, *Paolino*, 96; Colombi, *Rusticitas*, 409-10; 419; Coşkun, *Worldly Convert's Life*.

<sup>20</sup> In l. 264, *conferre* means to 'bestow' s.th. on s.o., while it denotes to 'compare' in l. 266.

<sup>21</sup> For *clarus* in this sense, cf. Aus. *Protr.* 96 (ed. Green, see n. 6) with Coşkun, *Gens Ausoniana*, 151 n. 119; for *clarissimus*, *ThLL* 3.1275.

Further on, *saepe* (l. 266), *ambitiosa studia* and *nostrī honores* (ll. 269–70) certainly allude to more than a single advancement. To start with the year 397, the Roman senator Symmachus seems to attest an *adlectio in senatum*, either of Paulinus himself or of one of his brothers<sup>22</sup>. He may later have served in palatine offices of senatorial rank or in the imperial administration as a provincial governor. It is difficult to see how the aristocrat could have turned down the bids by earlier usurpers or by the general Fl. Constantius, all of whom were dependent on regional support among the propertied class – just as Attalus would soon be<sup>23</sup>.

If this interpretation is right, it is less surprising that Paulinus explicitly distances himself from the *potentes* and *patroni*, although the grandson of Ausonius was never less than the peer of the most powerful Bordelaises, if not superior to all of them, as may be inferred from his conspicuous exemption from *hospitalitas* in A.D. 413/14. Apart from that, other factors seem to have had an impact on the terminology of these lines as well. While the widespread influence of Christian rhetoric of the rich and poor as well as of the powerful and weak is generally acknowledged today<sup>24</sup>, its effect on the *Eucharisticos* has

<sup>22</sup> Symm. *epist.* 5.58, with Coşkun, *Gens Ausoniana*, 159 n. 149.

<sup>23</sup> Already McLynn, *Paulinus*, 470–3 has identified the usurpers with the *patroni*, but purports that Paulinus actively sought promotion since the outbreak of the feud with his *indocilis frater*. The tenure of offices prior to the *comitiva largitionum privatarum* is further deduced from the importance of this palatine office (173), although this must not necessarily have been the case, given the illegitimate character of Attalus' reign. At any rate, Germanic kings also deserve to be taken into consideration as *patroni* or *potentes*, see above, with n. 16 and below, with n. 35.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. D. Grodzynski, "Pauvres et indigents, vils et plébéïens. Une étude terminologique sur le vocabulaire des petits gens dans le Code Théodosien", *SDHI* 53, 1987, 140–218; J.A. Schlumberger, "Potentes and Potentia in the Social Thought of Late Antiquity", in F.M. Clover-R.S. Humphreys (eds.), *Tradition and Innovation in Late Antiquity*, Wisconsin 1989, 89–104; Marcone, *Social Relations*, 343; P.R.L. Brown, *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire*, Hannover-New England 2002.

hitherto been overlooked. Last but not least, it seems to be of some importance for the autobiographer's choice of words that Augustine states that he relied on patronage for his own career as well<sup>25</sup>.

Eventually, the *comitiva largitionum privatarum* was the pinnacle of Paulinus' career – and the turning point in his life. According to the *Notitia dignitatum*, this office would have made him some kind of deputy to the better-known *comes rerum privatarum*, as is commonly assumed<sup>26</sup>. Claiming “oscillazione terminologica”, Marcone rather suggests that Paulinus was in fact *comes rerum privatarum*, after he having figured as *comes sacrarum largitionum* in Karl Friedrich Stroheker's prosopography. Ralph Mathisen, in turn, assumes that the functions of the two financial counts had been amalgamated<sup>27</sup>.

It is indeed uncertain how far the conditions set out in the *Notitia dignitatum* can be transferred to the improvised court of Attalus, whose ephemeral influence was restricted to some parts of Gaul. Given the particular circumstances – the limited extent of the usurper's realm on the one hand, and the high social rank of Paulinus on the other – Mathisen's explanation is surely the most attractive. The name of the function would then imply firstly a responsibility for imperial spending, and, secondly, that most of the available money would derive from imperial estates (the *res privatae*) in Southern Gaul. This interpretation would go along with the emperor's desperate need of money as stated in ll. 296–301.

Paulinus oddly qualifies the office – or rather its tenure (ll. 293–6) – as ‘empty’:

<sup>25</sup> *Conf.* 6.11.18 *amicos maiores, quorum suffragiis opus habemus*; also 6.14.24 on the rich Romanianus; Coşkun, *Worldly Convert's Life*; also Colombi, *Rusticitas*, 413–6 on l. 203 and 219.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. *Not. dign. occ.* 12.4, followed, e.g., by Rocafor, *De Paulini vita*, 48; A.H.M. Jones–J.R. Martindale–J. Morris (eds.), *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, Cambridge 1971, I, 678; Moussy, *Paulin*, 156–7.

<sup>27</sup> Marcone, *Paolino*, 102–3, with reference to Delmaire, *Responsables*, 189 with n. 150; likewise Näf, *Standesbewußtsein*, 130. – Stroheker, *Senatorischer Adel*, 203 and Demandt, *Spätantike*, 27. – Mathisen, *Aristocrats*, 83/193 n. 37.

*ut me conquirens solacia vana tyrannus  
 Attalus absentem casso oneraret honoris  
 nomine, privatae comitivam largitionis* 295  
*dans mihi quam sciret nullo subsistere censu*

This characterisation has induced many readers to conceive the title as merely honorary<sup>28</sup>. But McLynn explains the ‘emptiness of the title’ more convincingly by the “emptiness of Attalus’ coffers”, which, after l. 296, is once more stated in ll. 300-1: *poterat per se nihil ipse / aut opibus propriis*<sup>29</sup>. And, as has been mentioned above, Paulinus’ absence does relate to his promotion, not to his tenure of the office.

Moreover, McLynn suggests that Paulinus was responsible for confiscations among his compatriots. It is true that the estates of condemned owners would automatically have become part of the imperial *res privatae*, and this interpretation is tempting in light of the wrath that Paulinus was incurring among his fellow citizens. Notwithstanding this, it is implausible that the illegitimate government, while it still had to cope with the billeting of the Goths and was already blocked from the Mediterranean trade by Constantius, would have dared to further alienate the magnates by such a loathsome practice. On the contrary, being renowned for his wealth (l. 255), Paulinus had been summoned to court, precisely in order to accommodate the wealthiest and most influential of the Aquitanians. In addition, his fame for

<sup>28</sup> Cf. the translations of Evelyn White, *Ausonius*, 329: “empty title of distinction ... although he knew that this office was sustained by no revenue”; Moussy, *Paulin*, 79: “charge purement illusoire”, with his comment on p. 156: “le pouvoir de cet usurpateur était tout illusoire”; further A.H.M. Jones et al. (eds.), *Prosopography*, 1.678 with reference to *absentem* (l. 294); Delmaire, *Responsables*, 189; Mathisen, *Aristocrats*, 126: “empty honorary title”. Less decisive is Marcone’s translation (*Paolino*, 53): “mi onorò, senza che io fossi presente, del vacuo nome di una carica conferendomi il ministero delle largizioni private, benché sapessi di non disporre di alcuna risorsa”; likewise his comment on p. 103. Differently, however, Vogt, *Lebensbericht*, 572 n. 12 presupposes the effectiveness of the office.

<sup>29</sup> McLynn, *Paulinus*, 471; likewise, Caeymaex, *Charactère*, 190-1; Colombi, *Rusticitas*, 419.

being efficient in improving soil and organising the work of huge estates (ll. 187-212; also 522-38) will have recommended him once more for the tasks of the financial count. At any rate, since Paulinus appears to have been the top representative Bordelaise in Attalus' – or rather Athaulf's<sup>30</sup> – regime, the discussion of whether the *comitiva* was effective or merely honorary turns out to be entirely futile.

### III. Paulinus' Condemnation in Bordeaux (A.D. 414)

When the Goths saw their hopes of a peaceful settlement shrink and were compelled to leave Aquitaine, they gave free reign to their wrath and pillaged and burnt down Bordeaux, along with other towns. It is unclear why they also sacked Paulinus' estates (ll. 308-14). They certainly somehow regarded him as disloyal (cf. 362 *Gothos rursum mihi dira minari*; referring to A.D. 414/15), if only because – in contrast to Attalus – he preferred to stay in his home city and would thus necessarily have to reach an agreement with Constantius. But after the 'guests' had left as barbarous 'enemies', Paulinus underwent even harsher punishment (ll. 315-8)<sup>31</sup>:

*in qua (sc. urbe Burdigala) me inventum comitem  
tum principis eius]  
imperio cuius sociatos non (or nos?) sibi norant,  
nudavere bonis simul omnibus et genetricem  
iuxta meam mecum communi sorte subactos.*

By whose authority and according to which procedure was Paulinus condemned, and what did his punishment consist of? At first sight, these questions appear trivial, given that the expulsion and expropriation of his family is deplored explicitly in ll. 315-

<sup>30</sup> See below, n. 35.

<sup>31</sup> Some scholars unduly amalgamate the two punishments, cf. Rocafor, *De Paulini vita*, 49; 55-6.; Caeymaex, *Charactère*, 191: Paulinus flees from the Goths to Bazas; Johnston, *Paulinus*, 767: the Goths "penalized Paulinus, as an official of Attalus, by appropriating all his belongings and those of his mother"; see also n. 32.



27. Both could legally only be imposed by the emperor or his administrators, which has been taken for granted in modern scholarship<sup>32</sup>. However, it is doubtful whether the emperor or his administration were re-established in Bordeaux by mid- or late 414, so that they might have examined the case and condemned the accused. This premise is further excluded by the fact that the Goths were still vexing Aquitanian cities, when Paulinus had already moved and settled in Bazas after the verdict had been imposed upon him (see below, sect. IV).

Nor do other pieces of information fit the picture of a normal criminal trial. An inquisition of *laesa maiestas* had to be conducted using torture on all suspects: slaves, clients and the accused himself, whatever rank he might have enjoyed, although none of his *familia* was harmed; conviction for high treason entailed capital punishment, in cases of reprieve, expropriation and deportation, or, at least, exile or enclosure in a monastery, but Paulinus lost only his possessions in the Bordeaux area, while he could move freely outside the territory of this city; Roman law ruled out liability for a crime committed by a kinsman, but, apart from his own patrimony, the estates of his mother (and probably

<sup>32</sup> Honorius' authority is stated explicitly by Mathisen-Sivan, *New Identity*, 9-28. Cf. also Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire*, 93 and 94: "ses compromissions avec Attale l'ont fait condamner à la confiscation". The same Courcelle, however, elsewhere attributes "la confiscation de ses immenses domaines" to "les Wisigoths d'Aquitaine" (*Recherches*, 465). A similar confusion mars the account of Rouche, *Aquitaine*, 31: "le patrimoine paternel confisqué depuis 415"; 168: "ses biens personnels passèrent aux mains des Goths, parce qu'ils le considéraient comme un ennemi et un traître, et qu'ensuite ceci eut lieu avec la bénédiction des Romains qui n'observèrent pas ses droits, c'est-à-dire ceux de garder probablement un tiers du total"; and further down on Paulinus' sons: "sur qui n'aurait pas dû en bon droit romain retomber les griefs faits au père". The idea of a confiscation is rejected by McLynn, *Paulinus*, 475 with n. 83; 477 with nn. 93-4; but his account is biased by too critical a stance against the autobiographer: "Paulinus ... simply neglected to exercise effective control over his Aquitanian properties; the quartering of Goths upon these will have complicated the extraction of revenues (and his own previous dealings with the Goths no doubt discouraged him from personal intervention)".

of his wife) are also said to have been taken away, though, again, only those located in the Bordeaux area seem to have been at stake, as becomes clear later<sup>33</sup>.

It follows from all this that the condemnation was due to the authority of this city. One might certainly object that such a competence was even less in accordance with Roman law, but it is implied by several allusions nevertheless. The fact that Paulinus and his family were not harmed personally proves that they had not been urged to flee a spontaneous uprising, led by hatred and despair; rather, the city council acted deliberately in that it withdrew from them their Bordelaise citizenship collectively. And by calling the *barbaricae rapinae*, the *Romanum nefas* and the *nomina cara* responsible for his misfortunes (ll. 423–30), the author does not indicate that the punishment had been backed by the emperor Honorius or by one of his governors – let alone imposed – but simply names his Gallo-Roman compatriots *Romani*, as he does throughout the poem<sup>34</sup>.

Indeed, there is an explicit reference to his fellow citizens in the context of the condemnation. This, however, has been obscured by recent editors, who read ll. 315–6 as follows: *in qua me inventum comitem tum principis eius, imperio cuius sociatos nos* (instead of *non*) *sibi norant*. While it does not really matter whether *princeps* denotes Attalus or rather Athaulf<sup>35</sup>, the decision between *non* and *nos* is important. The former is the transmitted version, while the latter has been conjectured by Carl Barth. His reading, while rejected by Wilhelm Brandes and Hugh Evelyn

<sup>33</sup> Differently, McLynn, *Paulinus*, 468 claims that his wife's estates lay outside the Bordelaise territory and remained safe; Heinzelmann, *Gallische Prosopographie*, 666 locates her home city in Bazas, but this is the origin of his great-grandfather (l. 332 *patria maiorum*). It rather seems that Paulinus' considered his wife's estates his own property, as is also implied by the care he took of them (l. 187–201). On his mother's extraction and possessions, see above, sect. I with n. 11.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. also l. 235; 379; and see above, n. 15.

<sup>35</sup> He is usually identified with the usurper Attalus, cf., e.g., Moussy, *Paulin*, 160. This is certainly indicated by the terminology, for the technical meaning of *comes* relates back to Paulinus' *comitiva pril. larg.* (l. 295), whereas *princeps* and *imperium* (cf. also l. 300) normally refer to an

White, has been reinstated by Claude Moussy and followed by Joseph Vogt and Arnaldo Marcone<sup>36</sup>. Accordingly, Vogt translates as follows: “Mich, den sie damals dort als Minister des Herrschers fanden und den sie doch als Anhänger seines Kaisertums kannten, haben sie mit einem Schlag um alle Güter gebracht, wobei sie meine Mutter demselben Schicksal wie mich unterwarfen”.

But it is hardly reasonable to change the transmitted text, only to ignore the alterations between the 1<sup>st</sup> person singular and plural (*me – sociatos – nos – meam mecum – subactos*)<sup>37</sup>. The construction of *nosse* with the dative case (*sibi*) is indeed peculiar, but perfectly understandable<sup>38</sup>. Accordingly, *sociatos* refers to all who adhered to the Goths (3<sup>rd</sup> person plural), but *subactos* more specifically to *me ... et genetricem*, whence the 1<sup>st</sup> person plural in l. 319 (*nobis captis*). Evelyn White rightly translates l. 316: “whose allies they did not recognise as their own”. The relevance for the present chapter becomes apparent, as soon as

---

emperor, if only an illegitimate usurper. However, an untechnical reading of the latter terms would also permit to identify the *princeps* with Athaulf, who has not only been mentioned in the close context (l. 311), but is ascribed the real power in contrast to the usurper (ll. 297-301). And that is why Paulinus confesses to have opted for a peaceful arrangement with the Goths, a decision which ended up in his expulsion (ll. 302-27). Accordingly, it is tempting also to understand *comes* in an untechnical, if not deliberately ambiguous, sense. Without discussion, Athaulf has been regarded as the *princeps* also by Brun, *Un poète*, 23; Delmaire, *Responsables*, 189: “Il fut également le *comes* d'Athaulf à Bordeaux”; P. Heather, “The Emergence of the Visigothic Kingdom”, in Drinkwater-Elton, *Fifth-Century Gaul*, 89: Paulinus was one of the few office holders under Athaulf; Marcone, *Paolino*, 55: “in qualità di ministro del re”.

<sup>36</sup> C. Barth, “Ad Paulini Eucharisticum Animadversiones”, in *Animadversionum libri*, Frankfurt 1624; repr. in Chr. Daum, *Benedicti Paullini Petricorii De vita B. Martini libri sex*, Leipzig 1680-81, II, 254-94; Moussy, *Paulin*, 79; Vogt, *Lebensbericht*, 555; Marcone, *Paolino*, 55.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. also P. Courcelle, review of Moussy, *REA* 77, 1975, 406-7: “la correction de *non*, lection des deux manuscrits, en *nos* me paraît facheuse”.

<sup>38</sup> In contrast, Moussy, *Paulin*, 160-1 calls *sibi* a “réfléxive explétif” and *sibi norant* “un équivalent de *norant*”.

the anonymous subject of *norant* and *nudavere* is determined: it can only be identified with the Bordelaises, whereas the plural would be inappropriate for the legitimate Roman authority. The quality and the pathetic character of the argument would be likewise unsuitable for an imperial enactment.

At any rate, Paulinus suffered heavily from this verdict, but he accepted it insofar as he never returned home, either when Honorius re-established his authority in Gaul in the course of A.D. 415, or when he ordered a general amnesty in 416, or when the Goths returned as *foederati* in 418<sup>39</sup>. Even when composing the *Eucharisticos* in Marseille in 460, Paulinus regarded himself as a homeless exile<sup>40</sup>. In contrast, his sons could not put up with the withdrawal of the family's substantial patrimony. And as the property rights never expired due to the lack of an imperial enactment, they were able, if only several years later, to recover the Bordeaux estates at least partly. But this would happen long after the situation had become more stable, probably in the late 420s or the 430s<sup>41</sup>.

#### IV. Paulinus' Troubles in Bazas (A.D. 414/15)

After the expulsion from their home city, Paulinus and his family moved to Bazas, the *patria maiorum* (l. 332), where his mother had in all likelihood inherited houses and estates from her father Ausonius<sup>42</sup>. But, what was then equally significant, this city was in the region of Bordeaux, for the fugitives urgently needed shelter against various kinds of assaults. They were under threat from the Goths, who were pillaging Aquitaine and still had a score

<sup>39</sup> For the history of those years, see above, n. 13; for the amnesty *CTh* 15.14.14.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. *praef.* § 2 in *peregrinatione diuturna*; l. 491 *perpetuum exilium*; 542 *exul*.

<sup>41</sup> Differently, Rocafor, *De Paulini vita*, 55–6; 58 supposes that Paulinus returned to Bordeaux – or rather to its countryside in A.D. 415. For the time of the sons' departure see below, sect. V, with n. 56; for the wealth of the children, sect. VII; for the conditions of the Gothic settlement, sect. VIII.

<sup>42</sup> See above, with n. 11. Demandt, *Spätantike*, 27 erroneously purports that he “floh vor den Westgoten nach Spanien”.

to settle with Paulinus in particular (l. 362). Thus they rushed within the walls of Bazas, just before it was besieged by an Alanic army, which stood under the supreme command of the Goths<sup>43</sup>. But he there found himself at once threatened by a *factio servilis*, which after escaping his former compatriots and the barbarians altogether, came as a real surprise to him (ll. 333–40).

Extravagant interpretations have been offered to explain this episode. The assumption that the rabble-rousers were Bagaudae has rightly been rejected<sup>44</sup>. Other scholars suppose that younger noblemen wanted to force the city leaders to surrender, therefore stirring the riot<sup>45</sup>. But it is hardly acceptable to take the few ‘free-born’ participants (l. 335) as aristocrats with responsibility for the trouble. Alternatively, Neil McLynn suggests that the insurgents aimed at extraditing Paulinus, whom he considers the reason for the siege<sup>46</sup>. This explanation, however, neither fits the account of the uprising (ll. 334–42) nor of the ensuing negotiations with the Alan king (ll. 343ff.), for Paulinus must have known beforehand if he was the target of the attack.

In contrast, the whole affair can easily be explained as a simple hunger revolt. Most of the insurgents would have been country men who had fled hastily into the city without significant food supplies<sup>47</sup>. They would have been among the first to starve – or to

<sup>43</sup> Rouche’s account (*Aquitaine*, 21–2) seems to imply that they fled to Bazas, while it was already under siege. Though being compatible with the literal meaning of l. 331, they would rather have tried to avoid further trouble; moreover, it is questionable that the city would have opened its gates in such a precarious situation.

<sup>44</sup> For *Bagaudae*, cf. Sall. *Gub.* 5.24ff.; and, e.g., Rocafor, *De Paulini vita*, 50f.; Wolfram, *Goten*, 171; 179. *Contra* J.C. Sánchez León, “Orientius, Paulinus de Béziers y Paulino de Pella, ¿son fuentes de la historia de los Bagaudas Galos?”, in *Studia Zamorensia Historica* 7, 1987, 255–60; Marcone, *Paolino*, 106; for a concise reassessment of 5<sup>th</sup>-cent. *Bagaudae*, cf. Drinkwater, *Bacaudae*, 208–17. – Johnston, *Paulinus*, 767 speaks of “class war”.

<sup>45</sup> Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire*, 93–4; Rouche, *Aquitaine*, 21–2.

<sup>46</sup> McLynn, *Paulinus*, 473–4.

<sup>47</sup> Marcone, *Paolino*, 106 explains the uprise “con i disordini che, in varie città, fecero seguito all’invasione gotica”.

plunder stocks or houses belonging to the better-off, as implied in l. 336: *armata in caedem specialem nobilitatis*. But it is nowhere stated that they actually killed anyone. The governing class rather reacted 'at once' (l. 338 *ilico*), putting to death some of the rabble-rousers. As a consequence, Paulinus came to know about his personal jeopardy only afterwards (ll. 339–40). Overstressing the evil intentions of the rioters is not the slightest indicator that he never ceased to be a member of the nobility. Even in Bazas, he could be regarded as a peer of the leading citizens.

This conclusion can also be drawn from the ensuing events. In order to persuade the king to let him and his family escape, he firstly had to be in a position to steal away from the fortified walls, without being arrested as a traitor or killed in any fighting (ll. 353–5)<sup>48</sup>. He secondly managed to negotiate a prosperous bargain between the Alans and the city councillors, which saved the latter from pillage and the former from the control of the Goths (ll. 366–98). The Alans are said to have sent noble hostages into the city (ll. 379–80). Though not mentioned explicitly, it is inconceivable that the citizens of Bazas were not likewise required to offer security and material support. Maybe the *primates urbis* (l. 373) had to stay in Goar's camp, until the common enemy was turned away<sup>49</sup>.

Reflecting on this episode, Paulinus calls the undertaking an *error* (l. 345; 401) – despite the successful outcome. Modern historians, in turn, generally acknowledge the importance of his achievement, but still mostly regard him as a traitor because of his unauthorised intelligence with the enemy. But, in his defence, it may be said that he never intended to weaken the position of the citizens; and, more importantly, as a fugitive from Bordeaux, he was less responsible for the fate of Bazas than for the security of

<sup>48</sup> It is further implied that he was able to gather sufficient background information inside the city walls. And neither the defenders nor the besiegers attacked him, although he was no official delegate of the city.

<sup>49</sup> *Pace* Mathisen, *Aristocrats*, 34, Paulinus did not 'end up as a hostage', for he went back into the city the morning after the bargain was made; his return may have been part of the deal, cf. l. 381 *reddor et ipse meis*.

his own family. And the latter he considered especially threatened after experiencing the rabble within the walls (ll. 343-5)<sup>50</sup>. It is further worth mentioning that the poem does not even allow us to assume that Paulinus had ever faced any criticism by the Bazadaises<sup>51</sup>. Whatever the point of view, Paulinus' behaviour did not lack courage.

A question that remains concerns the identity of the king, whom he felt closely attached to and whose shelter he therefore sought (ll. 346-9):

*ut me praesidio regis dudum mihi cari,  
cuius nos populus longa obsidione premebat,  
urbe ab obsessa sperare abscedere posse  
agmine carorum magno comitante.*

Some scholars regard him as the Goth Athaulf, which is incompatible with the whole account<sup>52</sup>. More convincingly, the majority of modern commentators prefer the identification with

<sup>50</sup> For treason, cf. Rocafor, *De Paulini vita*, 53 (Paulinus was loyal neither to Bazas nor to Rome, but only to Bordeaux); Misch, *Autobiographie*, 673; also Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire*, 94; Rouche, *Aquitaine*, 22; McLynn, *Paulinus*, 474-5 – Responsibility, in contrast, is also acknowledged by Näf, *Standesbewußtsein*, 131. Cf. also the assessment of his Bordelaise deal, above, n. 15.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. also Caeymaex, *Caractère*, 191: “Du reste, sa conduite, loin de scandaliser ses concitoyens, était hautement approuvée par eux”. Differently, Soler Merenciano, *Oratio cristiana*, 128: “acuerdo que muchos romanos vieron como desleal”.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Evelyn White, *Ausonius*, 335; Johnston, *Paulinus*, 767: “Thus deserted by their King and their confederates, the Goths raised the siege and withdrew”; Mathisen, *Aristocrats*, 34. A similar view seems to be implied in Heather's account (*Goths and Romans*, 322), for he calls the force of the Alans “seemingly small”. If the identification were right, Athaulf would have been reduced to the chieftain of no more than an Alanic tribe, shortly before he was murdered in A.D. 415. This is in itself improbable, but cf. also l. 311 on his responsibility for the sack of Bordeaux, which contrasts with his qualification as *dudum mihi carus* in l. 346; cf. further l. 362; 395-8.



the Alan Goar, who is further recorded as king in other sources<sup>53</sup>. But, with reference to l. 375 (*auxiliante deo cuius iam munus habebat*), it has recently been objected that king Goar is said to have been a pagan in the *Chronica Gallica* (A.D. 442), whereas Paulinus' friend is styled a Christian<sup>54</sup>. Although the matter cannot be decided with certainty, one must not forget that statements on religious adherence are particularly unreliable either in polemical or laudatory contexts. The example of Stilicho may serve as an illustration: he is qualified as friendly to Christians by Rutilius Namatianus and Eunapius, while he was favourable to pagans and even planning a persecution of the Christians according to Orosius; but, in fact, he was a Christian, as is assured by Augustine<sup>55</sup>.

The somewhat opaque qualification of the king in the *Eucharisticos* (l. 375) may well imply that Paulinus knew about Goar's conversion towards the end of his life (after A.D. 442). In this case, he wishes to state that the king had been on the right path for a long time already. But it is likewise feasible that the Alan was already Christian (though in all likelihood not yet baptised) in 414; the chronicler would then seek to discredit him by distorting his religious commitment. However this might have been, the autobiographer feels indebted to Goar and is therefore apologetic in tone.

#### V. Paulinus' Son at the Visigothic Court and the Move to Marseille (A.D. 427/42)

If the relative chronology as given in the autobiography is reliable, Paulinus' son who served a king left his father no

<sup>53</sup> Cf., e.g., Rocaford, *De Paulini vita*, 52; Moussy, *Paulin*, 164-5; Rouche, *Aquitaine*, 22/477 n. 26; Vogt, *Lebensbericht*, 372 n. 13; Fo, *Tentativo*, 371; Wolfram, *Goten*, 171 with n. 95; Marcone, *Paolino*, 107.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. J.R. Martindale (ed.), *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, Cambridge 1980, II, 2.514-5; McLynn, *Paulinus*, 474 n. 76, also referring to the *Vita St. Germani*, 28, *MGH Script. Merov.* 7, 1920, 271-2: *Gochari ferocissimo Alanorum regi*. The editor (Levison) adduces further sources to suggest identity.

<sup>55</sup> Rut. Nam. 2.41ff.; Eun. *frag.* 62-3; Oros. *Hist.* 7.38.1; Aug. *epist.* 97.2.

earlier than the latter's conversion to the Catholic church in A.D. 427 (ll. 474-80), whereas the catastrophe (ll. 512-4) happened to the courtier prior to Paulinus' move to Marseille. At that time, the autobiographer was between 55 and 60 years old – or 65 at the most, as can be inferred from his remarks on his physical constitution (ll. 537-41 *dum maiores melior uires mihi praebuit aetas* ...). Moreover, his wife seems to have died prior to the beginning of his *senectus*, which is implied in l. 496f.: *tum subtracta meae potuisset cum magis esse / apta senectuti iunctae ad solamina vitae*<sup>56</sup>. With regard to Paulinus' early marriage (A.D. 397) and the career of one of his sons, the departures and deaths bemoaned in ll. 495-8 could altogether fall into the late 420s and the 430s.

At any rate, the reader is taken back to the interval of A.D. 332/42 for the settlement in the Mediterranean city, and probably to 427/37 for the beginning of the courtier's career. Hence there is no doubt that the anonymous king was Theoderic I, who reigned from 418 to 451<sup>57</sup>.

<sup>56</sup> Further bits of chronological information may be gathered from l. 498: *quae mihi iam derant natis abeuntibus a me*. Commentators usually connect the relative pronoun to *solamina*. This may be right, but would strangely imply that his wife, while being alive, had not been able to comfort him over his sons' departures, which is somewhat contradictory to the preceding thought. Alternatively, *quae* could refer to the three women: they had already died, when his sons were about to leave his father; in combination with the next verse (499 *non equidem paribus studiis nec tempore eodem*), one might infer that (at least) one son had already left and (at least) one other was still staying with his family, when the wife died. On Paulinus' children, cf. also ll. 498, 542, 558.

<sup>57</sup> Rocafor, *De Paulini vita*, 59; Moussy, *Paulin*, 192 and Marcone, *Paolino*, 117 opt for the same king, though without explanation. Fo, *Tentativo*, 374, however, suggests Theoderic II. Mathisen, *Aristocrats*, 126ff.; Mathisen-Sivan, *New Identity*, 31 state that a career of a *Romanus* under Visigothic kings was not common before the 460s; Heather, *Visigothic Kingdom*, 90, followed by Drinkwater-Elton, *Fifth-Century Gaul*, 52 and Marcone, *Paolino*, 104, go back to the 450s; but the same Heather (89-90) dates the move of Paulinus' sons to the Visigothic court "after 418", supposing a sort of "lobbying". Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire*, 95 lets them depart from their father already in A.D. 418.

Paulinus' son is said to have been driven *libertatis amore*. This should be interpreted neither as a political nor as a psychological motivation. The sons were less concerned with escaping the control of Rome or of the father, but their *libertas* here rather means *liberalitas*. The noble offspring thus had a strong desire for a distinguished social standing<sup>58</sup>. The latter they hoped to recover – or to retain on a broader scale – by taking possession of their Bordelaise patrimony (ll. 501-2 *quam sibi maiorem contingere posse putabant / Burdigalae*). Despite the desperate tone of the *Eucharisticos*, it is manifest that Paulinus' children were rather successful, at least at the beginning, for they did manage to get hold of large estates and distinguished posts<sup>59</sup>.

The 'friend' of Theoderic one day probably moved on to the Visigothic capital Toulouse. It is even worth considering whether his father joined him together with other members of the *familia*. Though not necessarily, this assumption would well explain the link that the poem draws between the son's disaster (ll. 512-4), Paulinus' material losses (l. 515 *destituit prope cuncta pari mea commoda sorte*) and his subsequent settlement in Marseille (ll. 520-30). At any rate, one may conclude that Paulinus was once more deprived of a significant part of his patrimony and apparently avoided Theoderic's sphere of influence. This interpretation is consistent with the observation that neither the *sancti cari* nor the modest possessions in Marseille account for the move itself, but rather qualify the destination, which had been chosen on other grounds (see sect. VI).

It remains uncertain what the "unlucky deed and event" consisted of, but it is noteworthy that Paulinus seems to

<sup>58</sup> The first is posited by Wolfram, *Goten*, 235; the second is implied by Vogt, *Lebensbericht*, 530. For *liberalitas*, cf. *ThLL* 7.2.1318-9. Evelyn White, *Ausonius*, 34 ("freedom") and Moussy, *Paulin*, 93 ("indépendance") remain indecisive. But Marcone, *Paolino*, 116 convincingly explains: "semplice desiderio di indipendenza personale (o, più banalmente, di far carriera presso i nuovi padroni)", thus likewise rejecting political intentions.

<sup>59</sup> Pace Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire*, 95; Rouche, *Aquitaine*, 31: "propagande pro-gothique"; 168; Mathisen, *Emigrants*, 163.

acknowledge his son's guilt by the vague allusion *actu simul euentuque sinistro* (l. 513). Most scholars assume that the culprit was executed<sup>60</sup>. But as he is characterised *velut ad solacia nostra qui superest* (ll. 512-3), he may still have been alive when the *Eucharisticos* was being composed. In this case, he would probably be one of the "rich children" mentioned in l. 558, on which see below (sect. VII). If so, there would be no need to claim that the king had usurped illegal juridical power over a 'Roman'.

## VI. Paulinus' Old Age in Marseille (A.D. 432/42-60)

As has been pointed out in the previous section, Paulinus' decision to leave Aquitaine sometime between A.D. 432 and 442 had in all likelihood been induced by the serious conflict one of his sons had incurred with king Theoderic I. Marseille lay outside the latter's sphere of influence. Apart from this, the place he chose had two further advantages. Though mentioned only in the second instance, a city house, a garden and a vineyard formed the material basis for his and his servants' living. But the derogatory description of these possessions makes it clear that the autobiographer does not conceive them to have been the reason for his choice<sup>61</sup>. The first qualification of Marseille reads as

<sup>60</sup> At least, his death is taken for granted, cf. Evelyn White, *Ausonius*, 346; Moussy, *Paulin*, 198; Matthews, *Western Aristocracies*, 324; Delmaire, *Responsables*, 188; Marcone, *Paolino*, 119; McLynn, *Paulinus*, 477; Mathisen-Sivan, *New Identity*, 27. Only Brun, *Un poète*, 24 n. 3 expresses that the king's wrath and Paulinus' loss of his *commoda* do not necessarily imply death penalty. Cf. also Stroheker, *Senatorischer Adel*, 203, who claims that one of his sons was alive, when he moved to Marseille.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. ll. 522-34 *parva autem census substantia familiaris / nec spes magna novis subitura ex fructibus esset, / non ager instructus propriis cultoribus ullus, / (525) non vineta, quibus solis urbs utitur ipsa / omne ad praesidium vitae aliunde parandum, / sed tantum domus urbana vicinus et hortus / atque ad perfugium secreti parvus agellus, / non sine vite quidem vel pomis, sed sine terra / (530) digna coli ... Cf. Vogt, *Lebensbericht*, 531: "Es ist geradezu rührend, wie er in Massilia, der*

follows: *urbe quidem in qua plures sancti essent mihi cari* (l. 521). The fact that the presence of the ‘saints’ meant comfort to him, but had not caused the move itself, is likewise to be inferred from the adverb *quidem*.

But who were these anonymous ‘dear saints’? The first divine intervention in Paulinus’ life which is recorded as having been mediated by ‘saints’ took place prior to his conversion in A.D. 427: he had been dissuaded from retiring to his Eastern estates or living as an ascetic, but, instead, encouraged to undergo public penitence and to be readmitted to the church community *consilio sanctorum* (l. 462)<sup>62</sup>. As Paulinus had remained in Bazas after A.D. 414, it is reasonable to assume that he was in contact with local clerics or devout laymen<sup>63</sup>.

However, scholars often posit a link to the monastery of St. Victor in Marseille, which may be alluded to in the above-quoted l. 521. It has further been suggested that the *sancti* also comprised members of the ascetic Lérins circle. The main argument is taken from the fact that the famous writer Salvian had stayed there before moving to St. Victor<sup>64</sup>. For different reasons, David

---

Stätte seiner Zuflucht, noch ein kleines Gut aus früherem Familienbesitz an sich bringen kann”. But most scholars consider these possessions the main reason for the move, cf., e.g., Rocafor, *De Paulini vita*, 59.

<sup>62</sup> For in-depth discussion of Paulinus’ conversion, cf. Coşkun, *Worldly Convert’s Life*. Note, besides, that the idea of public penitence has been rejected by P. Galtier, “Pénitents et ‘convertis’ (Suite et fin)”, *RHE* 33, 1937, 286-7, but reinstated by É. Griffe, “Un exemple de pénitence publique au V<sup>e</sup> siècle”, *BLE* 59, 1958, 170-5; *idem*, “Paulin de Pella, le ‘Pénitent’”, *BLE* 76, 1975, 121-5.

<sup>63</sup> The assonance to l. 521 has induced Rouche, *Aquitaine*, 22 and Marcone, *Paolino*, 114 to identify these ‘saints’ with the monks of Saint-Victor in Marseille; similarly already Brun, *Un poète*, 31. Although he only moved there perhaps a decade later, a contact with them is certainly possible. However, Rocafor, *De Paulini vita*, 57 and Fo, *Tentativo*, 371 count bishop Amandus of Bordeaux among the *sancti*, which is less likely. Griffe, *Pénitence publique*, 172-3 is also thinking of other *conversi*. Moussy, *Paulin*, 180 remains undecided.

<sup>64</sup> Cf., e.g., Marcone, *Paolino*, 114; Colombi, *Rusticitas*, 412. Moussy, *Paulin*, 193 further names Prosper Aquitanus, but this one seems to have left Marseille in the early 430s, cf. W. Geerlings, “Prosper Tiro von Aquitanien”,

Woods considers some of the *Lerinenses* even to be Paulinus' kin. Although his prosopographical analysis is questionable, the assumption of a relation by blood to either of the monasteries cannot be ruled out categorically, given the widespread influence of the *gens Ausoniana* in 5<sup>th</sup>-century Southern Gaul<sup>65</sup>. The qualification of the 'saints' as *cari* may be a further hint, although the adjective is likewise appropriate for intimate friends<sup>66</sup>.

Be this as it may, every attempt at identifying the *sancti* who operated as his spiritual mentors in Bazas or Marseille remains hypothetical<sup>67</sup>. The evidence does not even allow us to rule out that it was only much later that the 'saints' of Marseille became 'dear' to Paulinus. Note that, during the first years after his arrival, his prime concern seems to have been the cultivation of inherited and rented estates (ll. 522-38). At any rate, it seems that Paulinus' attachment to them was not the least motivation for him to renounce living in Bordeaux together with his 'rich children' (below, sect. VII). He was hesitant, though, and some scholars interpret his nostalgic deliberations as having in fact caused him to leave Marseille, but, as Neil McLynn has recently made clear, the autobiography leaves no doubt that he stayed<sup>68</sup>.

---

S. Döpp - W. Geerlings (eds.), *Lexikon der antiken christlichen Literatur*, Freiburg <sup>2</sup>1999, 520-1.

<sup>65</sup> For Woods, see above, sect. I with n. 8. For the *gens Ausoniana*, see above, n. 7.

<sup>66</sup> The adjective *carus* is mainly used in reference to close relatives (l. 221, 242, 247, 278, 349, 427); differently, it qualifies his peaceful life before A.D. 407 (l. 202), his *domus* and *patria* (l. 242), his *pudor* (l. 581), the Alan king (l. 346), whom Paulinus had considered more than only an acquaintance, cf. his reaction in l. 355-65.

<sup>67</sup> It is neither excluded that *conversi* or clerics around (or on) the episcopal see of Marseille were among them.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. l. 544-5 *Burdigalam revocare gradum conducere duxi / nec tamen effectus nostra est incepta secutus*; cf. also l. 420 on his failure to move Eastwards: *nec vero mea est proventus vota secutus*. This view is accepted by many scholars, cf. Moussy, *Paulin*, 196; Marcone, *Paolino*, 119; McLynn, *Paulinus*, 478-9; S. Mattiacci, review of Marcone 1995, *Prometheus* 22, 1996, 93. In contrast, others believe that Paulinus finally did return to Bordeaux, cf. Stroheker, *Senatorischer Adel* (see n. 3), 203; Helm,

This is why Paulinus still regards himself as an *exul* (l. 542) at the twilight of his life (above, n. 40).

### VII. Paulinus' 'Rich Children' (l. 558)

Towards the end of the autobiography, Paulinus writes of how he experienced God's clemency through a Gothic settler, who paid him for an acre which had formerly belonged to him. Thus was laid the groundwork for his financial independence. Prior to this sort of 'happy ending'<sup>69</sup>, Paulinus emphasises the misery he had to endure in his old age (ll. 539ff.), with the pathetic outcry *exul inops caelebs* (l. 542) as its climax. These adjectives combine three recurrent themes: his expatriation (above, sect. III), his 'impoverishment' (below, n. 78) and his loneliness (ll. 492-515). The characterisation of himself as *caelebs* has been taken as an argument to prove that all his children had died by then. But despite various usages of the adjective, it properly denotes *sive eum, qui numquam uxorem habuit, sive eum, qui eam amisit*<sup>70</sup>.

At first glance, the same information seems to be implied in the passage, in which, after the lamentation *iam dudum cunctis affectibus expers* (l. 492), the fates of two sons are bemoaned. It has been pointed out, however, that the son who served Theoderic I is not explicitly said to have been executed (above, sect. V). Moreover, neither does l. 492 necessarily imply the death of his

---

Paulinus, 2352.51-2; Evelyn White, *Ausonius*, 344-5, who misreads l. 520 *Massiliae demum pau<lis>per consistere legi*; Johnston, *Paulinus*, 768; Mathisen, *Emigrants*, 162-3; *idem*, *Aristocrats*, 62; B. Dümmler, "Paulinus von Pella", in Siegm. Döpp-Wilhelm Geerlings (eds.), *Lexikon der antiken christlichen Literatur*, Freiburg 1999<sup>2</sup>, 482-3; Soler Merenciano, *Oratio cristiana*, 128. Brun, *Un poète*, 28-30 remains undecided: "le libellé du texte serait favorable à Marseille, mais le contenu est favorable à Bordeaux. ... La sagesse est de se résigner à ignorer".

<sup>69</sup> Cf. also McLynn, *Paulinus*, 465-6: the episode helps to "bring the poem to a beautifully neat conclusion".

<sup>70</sup> Cf. *ThlL* 3.65-6, with reference to *Gramm. suppl.* 122.1; also Isid. *orig.* 10.34 *conubii expers*.



entire family. It must rather be concluded that none of his close relatives was still living together with him.

Towards the end of the poem, Paulinus thanks God for miraculously and constantly granting him support throughout his misfortunes (ll. 552-3). In his praise of the Lord (ll. 554ff.), he makes a puzzling acknowledgement, for, in contrast to the pessimistic tone of the previous lines he now reveals that he had further children – and even more: he qualifies them as ‘rich’ (556ff.):

*nescio si salvo possim gaudere pudore,  
sive quod ipse adhuc propriae speciei domus utens,  
seu quod divitibus contentus cedere natis (or notis?)  
omnia, quae possunt etiam nunc nostra videri,  
expensis patior me sustentari alienis.* 560

Most commentators have been at odds over this confession. Wilhelm Brandes suggests, though only hesitantly in his *apparatus criticus*, changing the transmitted *natis* to *notis* (‘acquaintance’). With Claude Moussy’s edition, this conjecture has become the standard reading<sup>71</sup>. But, as shown above, it is neither necessary nor justified to gloss over the admittedly remarkable revelation. Paulinus may in fact have had one or more children living in Bordeaux or Bazas at the time of writing the *Eucharisticos*, with or without the failed courtier. Also the daughter who had left her *patria* nearly half a century before (ll. 325-7) has to be remembered. In particular, the silence about

<sup>71</sup> Brandes, *CSEL* 16.1, 312: “fort. *notis*”; Moussy, *Paulin*, 96; 198; Vogt, *Lebensbericht*, 568; Marcone, *Paolino*, 70; 119. In contrast, McLynn, *Paulinus*, 480-1 rejects the conjecture, though without further argument. Evelyn White, *Ausonius*, 346 maintains *natis*, though commenting in n. 2: “Yet his sons (ll. 498ff.) had died previously. Possibly these are younger sons ignored in the earlier passage”. But it must be excluded that Paulinus begot other children after his son’s conflict at court, for his wife was too old, if not dead; nor will the convert have had a concubine after his conversion in A.D. 427, let alone another *spurius* after his youth, cf. l. 172: *nec quem quam fuerit spurius post qui meus umquam*.

the latter in the report of the bitter losses in ll. 503-15 suggests that the author did not intend to give a complete account of his children's fates.

Accordingly, Paulinus was thinking of more than two *nati* in l. 488 and possibly also in l. 498. In what follows, however, he deals solely with the two sons who went to Bordeaux and ultimately failed. Hence he lost all hope of any comfort to be gained from his children, as is expressed in ll. 516-7: *atque ita subtracta spe omni solaciorum, / quae mihi per nostros rebar contingere posse*. This sad experience, he continues, enabled him to rely on God alone (ll. 518-9).

Two other passages of the poem seem likewise to imply that Paulinus still had close personal bonds to Aquitaine in A.D. 460. Firstly, a passing comment on the Bordelaise harbour reveals that he had obtained news from the capital very recently (l. 47 *nunc etiam*). Secondly, the aforementioned Goth who came to Marseille, in order to pay him for an estate somewhere in Aquitaine, had certainly been urged to do so by one of Paulinus' 'rich children'. Last but not least, further descendants of the poet Ausonius can be identified as having lived among the nobility of 5<sup>th</sup>-century Gaul. Some of them may well have been Paulinus' children, grandchildren, or nephews. Since he firstly does not seem to have bequeathed his possessions to the 'saints' intimate to him (l. 521), let alone to people more distant from him (i.e. to people of his 'acquaintance'), and secondly had further relatives living at that time, there is no reason to mistrust the indications of the *Eucharisticos*<sup>72</sup>.

It follows from this that, in A.D. 460, some of Paulinus' offspring not only had survived, but, despite all misfortunes, even managed to maintain significant parts of the inherited wealth or even to acquire new resources. What Paulinus calls an offence to his *pudor* (ll. 556, 581) and *expensae alienae* (l. 560), probably implies nothing else than that he had to accept financial support

<sup>72</sup> Paulinus may well have had other children, grandchildren, nephews, etc., apart from the relatives with whom he split, when leaving Bordeaux in A.D. 414. For his kin, see above, n. 7. For the *sancti*, see above, sect. VI.

from his children after transferring all his belongings to them, including the property rights of his Marseille house (ll. 552; 557). These qualifications are certainly odd, but have to be explained by the autobiography's narrative strategy on the one hand (preparation for the 'happy ending'), and the impact of Christian rhetoric on the other (above, nn. 24-5).

### VIII. On the Settlement of the Germanic Peoples in 5<sup>th</sup>-Century Gaul

For the conditions of the Gothic settlement in 5<sup>th</sup>-century Gaul, the *Eucharisticos* is one of the prime sources. The first reference is given in l. 285: *hospite tunc etiam Gothico quae sola careret* (cf. 289-90). Accordingly, shortly after Athaulf had invaded Gaul in A.D. 412, his people were lodged as 'guests' among the inhabitants. While this had been a common practice also for the Roman army, especially in frontier zones, nothing is known for certain about the final arrangement that the king had agreed upon with the Romans. However, private quartering was but an intermediate step in 413/14. The fact that the Romans were prepared to provide at least some of the invaders with land, if they did military service for the emperor, is indicated in ll. 396-8:

*nostri quos diximus auxiliares* (i.e. the Alans that had  
defended Bazas)  
*discessere fidem pacis servare parati*  
*Romanis, quoquo ipsos sors oblata tulisset.*

*Sors oblata* is apparently a technical term for allotted land<sup>73</sup>. The Goths also obtained ground to settle, when they returned to Gaul in A.D. 418. This is not only alluded to in ll. 304-5 (the peace with the Goths was *mercede redempta*), but clearly revealed

<sup>73</sup> For *sors oblata* in this sense, cf. Rouche, *Aquitaine*, 167; Mathisen, *Aristocrats*, 71; 194 n. 32; Marcone, *Paolino*, 107. For Alanic settlements in Gaul, cf. L.B. Kovalevskaia, "La présence alano-sarmate en Gaule: confrontation des données archéologiques, paléontologiques, historiques et toponymiques", in F. Vallet-M. Kazanski (eds.), *L'armée romaine et les barbares*, Rouen 1993, 209-32.

in l. 502: *Gothico quamquam consorte colono*. Obviously, the sons of Paulinus had to share their Bordelaise patrimony with the new allies.

The actual terms of the settlement are a matter of controversy. While the classical view put forward by Ferdinand Lot is that of a repartition of land, Walter Goffart suggests a tax-based gratification for the Goths. Both studies, however, rely on a great deal of unsupported detail, whereas recent scholarship no longer insists on one single mode. On the one hand, Hagith Sivan underlines the significance of the deserted or imperial lands that could be assigned; on the other, Peter Heather firstly makes the distinction between land allocations in A.D. 418 and grain supply as price for a clearly defined military service, and secondly dates the Gallo-Romans' obligation to pay taxes to the Goths on a regular basis only to the mid-fifth century<sup>74</sup>. The evidence of the *Eucharisticos* and of the Theodosian Code (7.8 *De metatis*) seems to be compatible with the latter's sophisticated view, which could, however, be combined with many of the points raised by Sivan. At any rate, the subject still deserves to be further clarified<sup>75</sup>.

<sup>74</sup> F. Lot, "Du régime de l'hospitalité", *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 7, 1928, 925-1011; W. Goffart, *Barbarians and Romans A.D. 418-584. The Techniques of Accommodation*, Princeton 1980; H. Sivan, "On *Foederati*, *Hospitalitas*, and the Settlement of the Goths in A.D. 418", *AJPh* 108, 1987, 759-72; Heather, *Goths and Romans*, 421-2. – Heather, *Visigothic Kingdom*, 89-90 further assumes that Gallo-Romans wishing to recover former estates had to engage in "lobbying" at the Visigothic court. Although this cannot be ruled out, *Euch.* 498-515 does not support this assumption, see above, sect. V, with n. 57.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. also Moussy, *Paulin*, 200; Rouche, *Aquitaine*, 167-8, still following Lot, *Hospitalité*; M. Cesa, "Hospitalitas" o altre 'techniques of accommodation'? A proposito di un libro recente", *Archivio storico italiano* 140, 1982, 539-52; H. Wolfram, "Zur Ansiedlung reichsangehöriger Föderaten", *MIÖG* 91, 1983, 5-35; *idem*, *Goten*, e.g., 229; Drinkwater-Elton, *Fifth-Century Gaul*, 49-94; R. Schulz, *Die Entwicklung des römischen Völkerrechts im 4. und 5. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart 1993; Marcone, *Paolino*, 109-10 and 116-7, contradicting Goffart, *Barbarians* with reference to l. 398 and 502; W. Pohl (ed.), *Kingdoms of the Empire: the Integration of the Barbarians in Late Antiquity. Transformation of the Roman World*,

In a recent study, Ralph Mathisen and Hagith Sivan have also drawn attention to another passage of the autobiographical poem. In ll. 575-81, Paulinus thanks the Lord for providing for his material independence:

(*ut ...*, cf. l. 570)  
*emptorem mihi ignotum de gente Gothorum* 575  
*excires, nostri quondam qui iuris agellum*  
*mercari cupiens pretium transmitteret ultro,*  
*haut equidem iustum, verumtamen accipienti*  
*votivum, fateor, possem quo scilicet una*  
*et veteres lapsi census fulcire ruinas* 580  
*et vitare nova cari mihi damna pudoris.*

Mathisen and Sivan hypothesise that the Gothic buyer may have been identical with the *consors colonus* mentioned above (l. 502), “who wished to obtain clear title over the rest of the land”<sup>76</sup>. But this assumption would unconvincingly presuppose that only one Goth shared in the enormous Bordelaise estates of Paulinus. Why should the latter solely speak of *agellus*, or what could have induced the most powerful magnate to buy out the former owner, who now lived outside the Visigothic sphere of influence? Apart from these objections, Mathisen and Sivan overlook the fact that some of Paulinus’ children were still alive and had obtained the property rights from their father<sup>77</sup>.

The complaint about the inadequacy of the price could be explained in various ways. First of all, Paulinus consistently exaggerates his impoverishment and his misfortunes, so that

---

I, Leiden 1997; I.N. Wood, “The Barbarian Invasion and First Settlements”, in *CAH XIII*, 1998, 516-37; U. Heider, “Foederati”, *DNP* 4, 1998, 579-80; “Hospitalitas”, *DNP* 5, 1998, 743-4; Mathisen-Sivan, *New Identity*, 9-28 (p. 26: *Euch. 502 Gothico ... consorte colono* is erroneously related to the late A.D. 450s).

<sup>76</sup> Mathisen-Sivan, *New Identity*, 27.

<sup>77</sup> For the children, see above, sect. VII. Moreover, it is not stated explicitly that the *agellus* lay in the territory of Bordeaux; it may well have been located elsewhere in Aquitaine.

his allegations need not necessarily be justified<sup>78</sup>. In the case of a factual basis, they may be due to the decrease in value: perhaps they had been long abandoned or shared with the same or other Goths in the course of land allotment; whether the legal proportions were 2:1 or 1:1, the acre was apparently too small for a division (*agellus*), so that the new colonist was ready to pay for the remaining two thirds or half respectively. Alternatively, the unsatisfactory outcome of the bargain may have been due to the buyer's strong and Paulinus' weak position, but this could rather have resulted in no payment at all<sup>79</sup>.

One may finally ask whether either the acre's diminution in worth or the settler's wish to buy it had somehow been induced by the new terms of peace that Majorian and Theoderic II had negotiated in the course of A.D. 459. Although this consideration has to remain likewise hypothetical, the adverb *nunc* (l. 569) dates the event to the very recent past of the autobiographer.

## C. Appendix

### I. Conspectus of the Dates in the *Eucharisticos*

Setting out the lines in which Paulinus gives precise, though periphrastic, chronological information may allow us to make some additional observations. Admittedly, at least the first two conclusions are trivial, but they have repeatedly escaped the attention of commentators.

1) It was characteristic of Roman custom to count started time units fully, irrespective of whether cardinal or ordinal numbers were used. Cf. *CTh* 3.5.11 (A.D. 380) *ante duodecim annos, id est usque ad* (in Mommsen) *undecimi metas* ('before the age of eleven, that is until the end of the eleventh year'). Well known are examples as *ante diem III kal. Feb.* ('before the third day of the kalends ...' = 'two days before the kalends' = 'the 30<sup>th</sup> January').

<sup>78</sup> On his impoverishment, cf. ll. 239-30, 317-8; 481-2; 515-6; 519-20; 551-60; 572-4, but see above, n. 3.

<sup>79</sup> On the influence of Paulinus' children behind the scenes, see also above, sect. VII.

2) Otherwise, the period is explicitly stated to have passed entirely. Paulinus obviously prefers the latter mode to the former, as the subsequent list will show; the relevant remarks are underlined with a bold streak.

3) Whenever Paulinus refers to his age, saying 'I was x years old' or 'I was in my y<sup>th</sup> year', he gives clear indications to avoid confusion. Such references are underlined with a thin streak.

- a: ll. 12-4      *altera ab undecima annorum currente meorum  
hebdomade sex aestivi flagrantia solis  
solstitia et totidem brumae iam frigora vidi*  
(his current age)
- b: ll. 32-3      *ante suum nono quam menstrua luna recursu  
luce novata orbem nostro compleret ab ortu*  
(his age: arrival at Carthage)
- c: ll. 34-5      *Illic, ut didici, ter senis mensibus actis  
sub genitore meo proconsule ...*  
(his stay in Africa: duration)
- d: ll. 48-9      *tunc et avus primum illic fit mihi cognitus, anni  
eiusdem consul, nostra trieteride prima*  
(his age: first meeting of Ausonius)
- e: l. 72      *nec sero exacto primi mox tempore lustr*  
(his age: grammar classes)
- f: l. 121      *vix impleta aeui quinta trieteride nostri*  
(his age: malaria)
- g: ll. 176-7      *Talis vita mihi a ter senis circiter annis  
usque duo durans impleta decennia mansit*  
(his age: lascivity before marriage)
- h: l. 232      *sed transacta aeui post trina decennia nostri*  
(his age: invasions; father's death)  
(cf. ll. 246-7 *inter prima iuventae / tempora*)
- i: ll. 293-4      *ut ... tyrannus / Attalus ...*  
(his *comitiva*; the name defines the chronology)
- j: l. 474      *post autem, | exacta iam tetreteride quinta*  
(interval of adherence to *dogmata prava*:  
no reference to his age, therefore duration)



k: l. 478

*ante hos ter decies super et his quattuor annis*  
 (return to the sacramental community;  
 looking back from the time of writing)

Unfortunately, this list does not sufficiently explain what significance Paulinus attached to dating – either in respect to his life or to the structure of the autobiography. On the one hand, many of the outstanding events are clearly assigned to a year; on the other, the same is also true for less important incidents in his childhood, and the poem completely lacks further dates after his conversion. In particular, the conflict of Paulinus' son with Theoderic I had a serious impact on his life as well (see above, B. V-VI). But it may well be that this case was as well known in Southern Gaul as the consulate of Ausonius or the ephemeral usurpation of Attalus, both of which anchor the life outside the somewhat egotistical autobiography. At any rate, Paulinus' conversion appears to be a sort of deliberate seal: it had been an important event in his life, but was certainly more significant in his ultimate days, when he was facing death. The decisive turning point in his spiritual biography stands out even further insofar as it is incorporated into a threefold chronology. Whatever the purpose of chronological indications may have been, Paulinus seems to have had some serious intentions in using them, but failed to do so coherently.

## II. *Index Criticus*

Both the *codex Bernensis* (B) and the *editio princeps* by Margarinus de la Bigne (P) have been collated solely by Wilhelm Brandes. All later editors have relied on his *apparatus criticus* and likewise followed him in denoting the edition of the humanist scholar as *codex P(arisinus)* according to his now lost source. Although this is somewhat misleading, the same practice has been maintained here, in order to facilitate the use of this index. Paul Tordeur (*Concordance de Paulin de Pella*, Paris 1973) has previously registered the *lectiones variae* of the *Eucharisticos* (119-22), but, unfortunately, his list is marred with mistakes and thus of little help. Joseph Vogt's edition can be left aside, for he follows Claude Moussy's text throughout (the few deviations

are to be ignored as typing errors). In contrast, the Loeb edition prepared by Hugh Evelyn White has been taken into account, not only due to its widespread use, but also because some of his changes to Brandes seem to be deliberate; however, apparent typing errors have been marked with \*. The first *lectio* of every entry indicates my own preference. The subsequent register does not claim to be complete.

### Abbreviations

*B* : *Codex Bernensis 317 saec. IX*; *B*<sup>2</sup> : *corrector aequalis*; *B*<sup>3-4</sup> : *correctores saec. XVI/XVII?–XVIII*.

*P* : *Codex Parisinus deperditus, lectus a Margarino de la Bigne, Bibliotheca sanctorum patrum VIII, Paris 1579*.

*Ba* : Barth, *Animadversiones* (see n. 36)

*Br* : Brandes, *CSEL* 16.1 (see n. 1)

*Co* : Coşkun, *Chronology* (see n. 5)

*Da* : Daum, *Martini libri* (see n. 36), vol. 2.342–52

*EW* : Evelyn White, *Ausonius* (see n. 1)

*Ha* : Haase, *Adnotationes* (see n. 79a).

*Le* : Leipziger, *Paulini carmen*<sup>80</sup>.

*Ma* : Marcone, *Paolino* (see n. 3).

*ML* : McLynn, *Paulinus* (see n. 4)

*Mo* : Moussy, *Paulin* (see n. 1).

*Mü* : Müller, *Observationes* (see n. 1)

*Zu* : Zurli, *Paolino* (see n. 3).

### Index

*pr. tit.* ΕΥΧΑΡΙΚΤΙΚΟC (*sc.* λόγος) *B Mo* :  
ΕΥΧΑΡΙΚΤΙΚΟΝ *P Br EW*: ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΙΚΟC *Ma*  
*pr. 2* memoria marcescentem *P* : memorem arcentem *B*

<sup>80</sup> L. Leipziger, *Paulini carmen eucharisticum prolegomenis et adnotationibus illustratum*, Diss. Vratislava 1858; including F. Haase, “Adnotationes ad Daumii editionem ineditae, quibus Leipziger usus est”.

: memore marcentem *B*<sup>4</sup> : maerore *B in mg. (?)* : maerore marcescentem *edd.*

*pr.* 5 quae legerit *Mo Ma* : quae elegerit *P Br EW* : quaelegerit *B*

*pr.* 5 inculcata *BP Mo Ma* : inculcanda *Br EW*

*tit.* ΕΥΧΑΡΙCΤΙΚΟC (sc. λόγος) *B Br EW Mo Ma* : ΕΥΧΑΡΙCΤΙΚΟΝ *P*

l. 16 cursu *BP edd.* : *vel potius cursum?*<sup>81</sup>

l. 36 urbis *BP Mo Ma* : orbis *Ba Br EW*

l. 44 Garumna *P Br EW* : Garunna *B Mo Ma*

l. 53 <dudum> *Mo Ma* : \*\*\* *BP EW* : <posthac> *Br*

l. 67 evitare *P* : vitare *B edd.*

l. 67 ἀκοινωνόητα *edd.* : akinononta *B* : akinononta *P*

l. 75 protinus ad *BP edd. cet.* : protinus et *EW\**

l. 93 hoc *BP edd. cet.* : hac *EW\**

l. 100 quoquo : quo *B* : quomodo *P* : quoniam *Ba edd.*

l. 126 prospicerentur *BP edd. cet.* : perspicerentur *EW*

l. 142 firmatur *BP* : firmatus *B<sup>3</sup> in mg. Ba edd.*

l. 146 sphaera *BP edd. cet.* : sphaera *EW*

l. 170 novisse *P* : nosse *B edd.*

l. 174 quissent *BP*<sup>82</sup> : quisset *Ba edd.*

l. 219 luxoriae *B Mo Ma* : luxuries *P* : luxuriae *Br EW* : luxuriei *Ba*

l. 255 mearum *BP edd. cet.* : meorum *EW*

l. 269 patronorum *BP edd. cet.* : patronarum *EW\**

l. 270 et nostri evidenter honores *Br edd.* : ex nostri evidenter honoris *BP*

l. 280 coeptos *BP edd. cet.* : coepto *EW*

l. 297 iamque *BP Br EW Mo* : cumque *Ha Ma*

<sup>81</sup> Possibly a nasal stroke has got lost in the course of the transmission; otherwise, *annos* would be the object to both, *instaurando* and *renovas* (ἀπὸ κοινοῦ).

<sup>82</sup> Predator to *lascivae* (gen.) *inlecebris* (dat.) *sociata iuventae* (gen.) *libertas*, hence *constructio ad sensum*.

l. 316 non *BP Br EW Courcelle (1975, 407)* : nos *Ba Mo Ma*

l. 346 ut *Ba edd. Zu (n. 25)* : consilii ut *BP* : consilio ut *Le*

l. 348 ab *BP edd. cet.* : a *EW*

l. 371 praestandaque ante<sup>83</sup> : praestanda quae autem *Br edd.* : praestandaque aût *B* : praestanda et prius *P* : praestanda esse prius *Ba*

l. 382 salvatus *BP edd. cet.* : salutatus *EW\**

l. 398 quoquo *BP edd. cet.* : quoque *EW\**

l. 399 atque ita res <tandem> temere a me coepta benigno : res <ingens> *Br EW (Mo in app.)* : res <a me> *Ba* : res \*\*\* *Mo Ma* : <suscepta> vel <concepta> *Ba*

l. 406 sint *BP Ba Mü Mo Ma* : sit *Ha Br EW*

l. 415 novique *BP Mo* : novaeque *Br EW Ma*

l. 431 gratulanda *B Mo* : gratuanda *P* : gratanda *Da Br EW Ma*

l. 445 solus : solis *EW\**

l. 451 ipse *BP Mo Ma* : ipso *Ba Br EW*

l. 474 tetreteride *B Co* : trie-teride *P* : ter trieteride *Tillemont edd.* : tetraeteride *Mü*

l. 478 his *BP Mo Ma Co* : bis *Ba Br in app. EW* : hos *Le*

l. 493 prima *BP Mo Ma (cf. l. 203)* : primo *Ba Br EW*

l. 520 pauper *BP edd. cet. ML (vid. supr. n. 69)* : paulisper *EW*

l. 541 et victus : est victus *BP* : evictus *edd.*

l. 542 exul inops caelebs <non iam> facile in nova versus/ consilia : <semper> *Br Mo Ma* : <caris> *EW*

l. 558 natis *BP Br EW ML (vid. supr. sect. B. VII)* : notis *Br in app. Mo Ma*

l. 566 solarier *B (B<sup>1</sup>?) P<sup>84</sup>* : solari es *Br edd.*

<sup>83</sup> Understand: “and urging (him) to choose what had to be granted, before he would soon have to try (to attain it violently and with uncertain outcome)”.

<sup>84</sup> Moussy, *Paulin*, 199 and Marcone, *Paolino*, 119 follow Brandes, *CSEL* 16.1, 313 in contesting the archaic infinitive of the passive voice

- l. 569 *iuvenascere* *P Br EW*<sup>85</sup> : *iuve nascere* *B* : *iuvenescere*  
*Mo Ma*  
 l. 585 *contestatas* *BP edd. cet.* : *contestatus* *EW\**  
 l. 593 *te et* *Br in app., edd. cet.* : *te* *BP* : *te* \* *Br* : *te te*  
*Ba* : *et te* *Ha*  
 l. 598 *qua* *BP edd.*<sup>86</sup> : *quam* *Ba Le*  
 l. 599 *plura* *BP Mü Mo Ma*<sup>87</sup> : *plura* <haut> *Br EW*  
 l. 608 *discrimina* *BP Mo Ma* : *discrimine* *Br EW*

ALTAY COŞKUN

Universität Trier

altay.coskun@uni-trier.de

*solarier*. By changing it to *solari es* and adding a comma after *dignate* as well as a semicolon after *medellis*, they brusquely deteriorate a correct and comprehensible text. The sentence as transmitted extends from l. 564 to 581 and has only one predicator (l. 569 *dedisti*); directly subordinated to it are the two preceding *participia coniuncta* (l. 564 *passus* and 568 *adsuetus*, linked by *-que*, l. 566); a third *participium coniunctum*, *dignate*, belongs to *Deus*, both in the vocative case; *passus* governs an *a.c.i.*, *dignate* and *adsuetus* an infinitive: “you who have deemed worthy to comfort”.

<sup>85</sup> For *iuvenascere*, cf. also *puerascere* in Aus. *Protr.* 55, with Green, *Ausonius*, 294.

<sup>86</sup> *Attractio relativi*.

<sup>87</sup> Moussy, *Paulin*, 204–5 follows Müller, *Observationes*, 64–6 in relating *nec* not only to *promptum est*, but also to *agnosco*. This obscures the point Paulinus is making, cf. Coşkun, *Worldly Convert's Life*. Rather translate: “that, for in this life, which I now live in high age, I acknowledge that other things are more to be afraid of than death itself, but there is nothing in my sight which I would rather wish ...”.